

E
400
F47
1849

UC-NRLF



\$B 60 888

YC 50550

Pennsylvania, a Citizen of
1844. A few plain facts, add-
ressed to the people of
Pennsylvania.

75

L A FEW

PLAIN FACTS,

ADDRESSED


TO


THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA.

BY A CITIZEN OF PENNSYLVANIA.

THIRD EDITION, ENLARGED.
WITH ADDITIONS.

PHILADELPHIA:
J. CRISSY, PRINTER, NO. 4 MINOR STREET.
1844.

 Distributed Gratis:—application for Copies to be made to E. C. MARKLEY, No. 4 Minor Street, Philadelphia.

 Hand this to your neighbour who intends to vote for Mr. Polk, and ask him to read it.

E 400

F 47

1844

In every political contest the natural inquiries are, What are the principles of the different parties, and for what are they contending? The friends of Mr. Polk assert that they are the true

DEMOCRACY

of the Country—and this claim constitutes their whole strength: we ask every friend of truth to examine and see what right they have to the name of Democracy. There are many who will refuse to examine, but there are others who will, and to them I address myself. It is the duty of every friend of his Country to think, reflect, and determine according to his conscience. A Democrat is one, who has confidence in the intelligence of the people, who believes that they are able to govern themselves—that the people are generally right, sometimes wrong, but always ultimately right: that it is the duty of every man to adopt such measures as will render them happy, contented and comfortable. The Loco Foco party have been in power under Gen. Jackson and Mr. Van Buren for twelve years. What measure did that party ever propose to assist the labouring class, or the people at large, or to relieve their distresses during the trying crisis through which, during that period, we passed? None!

In 1832 the four prominent questions of public policy were,

1. The Tariff.
2. The distribution of the proceeds of the Public Lands among the different States.
3. The protection of the National Currency, by a National Bank.
4. The system of Internal Improvement, to preserve, connect, and strengthen the union of the States.

These are all measures calculated to encourage trade and commerce, and give employment to the poor. These were at that time the favourite measures of the Democracy of Pennsylvania. Her Legislature and Governors, from time to time, instructed and requested her Senators and Representatives in Congress to support them—they have supported them, the Press has added its strength, and the people have ratified and confirmed them.

On all these questions, the friends of Mr. Polk have, at the command of Gen. Jackson, wheeled to the right-about-face, like a platoon, at the command of its officer, and with the exception of the Tariff, where, in certain parts of the State they endeavour, from necessity, to make some reservation, they are now pledged to oppose them with as much zeal and earnestness as they were before pledged to support them.

Mr. Dallas and the late Mr. Muhlenburg have been charged with apostacy on these subjects, as though it were the individual sin of these gentlemen. It is not so—it is the apostacy of the PARTY from its origi-

nal principles: and if any other distinguished Individuals in Pennsylvania, who, at that time, were in the legislative Councils, had been nominated, they would have been obnoxious to the same charge.

The most anti-Democratic, or Aristocratic feature in the Constitution of our Government is known to be the Executive power, and therefore, in the formation of the Constitution of the United States, Pennsylvania, and other States, this question divided parties more directly than any other. The Democratic party always opposed the Executive power as Aristocratic and anti-Democratic, yet the Loco Foco party has extended this power to its utmost stretch, in;

1. Unlimited removal from office for opinion's sake.
2. The frequent exercise of the Veto.
3. The extension of the Veto by the President, in the refusal to return the Land Bill to Congress, and permit two-thirds of both Houses to pass it.

4. The Establishment of the Sub-Treasury.

They tried first, the National Bank; next, the State Banks, which failed, because they selected pet Banks from favouritism, and not from solvency and ability to serve the public, and then the Sub-Treasury.

The Sub-Treasury placed the funds permanently in the hands of the officers of Government, led them into temptation, and corrupted them, as it would do any other set of men; hence so frequent have been the defalcations and flight of public officers, that a new and graphic term has been invented, and become legitimated in the American vocabulary, ABSQUATULATION.

In 1829 we were a happy, prosperous and contented people. One experiment after another upon the commerce, trade and domestic industry was tried, until we were reduced to National poverty, bankruptcy and disgrace. And what was the remedy proposed by Government? "*Let those, who trade on borrowed capital, break.*" These words were uttered by Gen. Jackson under excitement, but they are the platform of the administration of himself and Mr. Van Buren.

During all this time the Loco Foco party have been as radical as they were anti-Democratic. Instance,

1. The rejection in Congress of the Broad Seal of the State of New Jersey.
2. The refusal of the Loco Foco States to obey the Act of Congress dividing the States into Congressional Districts.
3. Dorr's rebellion in Rhode Island, and the support they give him in other States.
4. Repudiation by the Loco Foco party in Mississippi, Illinois, and other Western States.
5. Their efforts to array the poor against the rich.

In this country all the large fortunes have been accumulated by industry and integrity. Wm. Gray, of Salem, John Jacob Astor, of N. York, Girard, Ridgway and Pepper, of Philadelphia, Coleman, of Lancaster, and Heister, of Reading, prove it. No overgrown fortune has ever descended three generations—they are constantly revolving. The highest honours and competency of fortune are attained by industry, economy and health. In a word, Economy is Wealth. Turn to Jackson, Van Buren, and "the Mill Boy of the Slashes," and the most

striking proofs are exhibited: and yet the Loco Foco party tell the people, the rich are prone to and are daily oppressing the poor. The truth is, sympathy with the poor, not deference to the rich, is one of the characteristics of the American people.

6. The recent flagitious attempt on the part of the acting President to declare war against Mexico, sanctioned by the great mass of the Loco Foco party throughout the Union. I repeat, what principle, what measure, what system did the self-styled Democracy of Pennsylvania maintain in 1832, that they now support? I answer, none. They have the name without the substance. Our opponents are a party without principles. There is not one specific tangible principle by which they are distinguished. In New York it is Polk, *without* Texas, and in the interior of Pennsylvania it is Polk *with* the Tariff of 1842. In 1840 their watch words were Van Buren, Johnson and *Democracy*, now it is Polk, Dallas and *Texas*. They discarded Van Buren because he was opposed to Texas, they then nominated Silas Wright as Vice President, who was also opposed to Texas, and subsequently nominated Mr. Dallas in his place, because he wrote the first letter in favour of Texas.

Our opponents, some years ago, to designate their hostility to Banks, assumed the name of Loco Foco; and yet between the years 1830 and 1837, the Banking capital of the U. States was increased from 110 to 378 millions, of which 268 millions of increased Banking capital, 231 millions were created by the Loco Foco party.

THE TARIFF.

No subject more beautifully illustrates the philosophy of our Government than the practical operation of the Tariff, or protection of Domestic Industry. It enables the rich man to use his surplus capital to his own advantage, to give employment to the poor, and protect home labour. All Nations in Europe have a Tariff: every distinguished political economist on the Continent supports it. Great Britain, Spain, Portugal, the German States, Austria, Belgium, and even Holland, have established it. The Italian States, more feeble than the rest, are now forming one. France and Russia, more powerful than the others, have a prohibitory tariff on all the staple articles of the country. It may be asked, shall the Monarchs of Europe, claiming to be Autocrats by divine right, show more kindness and regard for the interest and prosperity of their subjects, than the Government of the United States for the people from whom they derive their power?

Labour in Europe ranges from 10 cents to 25 cents per day; 20 cents is the average. In the United States it averages from 75 cents to \$1 50 per day,—at Lowell it is \$4 per week, or 75 cents per day. The reason is obvious—in Europe the labourer is degraded, lives on vegetables, eats no meat, and subsists on almost nothing. In the United States the labourer is a freeman, lives on good substance, and being an honest man, neither fears nor envies the richest patroon about him. American labour cannot compete with foreign pauper labour with-

out protection, and the doctrine of the Loco Foco party would reduce our whole labouring populace to the degraded vassallage in which they live in Europe.

But, it is said the friends of Messrs. Polk, and Dallas are in favour of the 'Tariff, and Mr. Clay is not; or that he holds two languages, one for the South, and one for the North. A more unfounded charge never was made.

The practical question before the people is, the continuance or repeal of the Tariff of 1842. The Compromise Act of 1833 has been modified by the Act of 1842, and can be referred to only for the purpose of explaining our present position. Let us contrast the sentiments of Mr. Clay and Mr. Polk. I affix the opinions of Mr. Clay and Mr. Polk.

Ashland, 29th June, 1844.

My opinions, such as they are, have been quite as freely expressed at the South, as I ever uttered them at the North. *I have every where maintained that in adjusting a Tariff for revenue, discriminations ought to be made for Protection; THAT THE TARIFF OF 1842 HAS OPERATED MOST BENEFICIALLY, and that I AM UTTERLY OPPOSED TO ITS REPEAL.* These opinions were announced by me at public meetings in Alabama, Georgia, Charleston in South Carolina, North Carolina, and in Virginia.

Your friend and ob't servant,

H. CLAY.

Mr. Fred. J. Cope.

Winchester, May 29, 1843.

To the People of Tennessee.

I had steadily during the period I was a Representative in Congress, been opposed to a Protective policy, as my recorded votes and published speeches prove. Since I retired from Congress I had held the same opinion. In the present canvass for Governor I HAD AVOWED MY OPPOSITION TO THE TARIFF ACT OF THE LATE WHIG CONGRESS, as being highly protective in its character, and not designed by its authors as a revenue measure. I had avowed my opinion in my public speeches that the interests of the country—and especially of the producing and exporting States—REQUIRED ITS REPEAL, and the restoration of the principles of the compromise Tariff act of 1833.

JAMES K. POLK.

In a public speech made on the 3rd of April, 1843, Mr. Polk says,

"Distribution and a protective tariff are measures which I consider ruinous to the interests of the country, and especially to the interests of the planting States—I have steadily and at all times opposed both."

"The Wool-Growers consider the duty upon foreign Wool as important to their prosperity. This opinion is founded in error!"

"My opinion is that WOOL should be duty free!"

In 1833, Mr. POLK was a member of the Committee of Ways and Means, which committee proposed to impose a duty of twenty per ct. on tea and coffee, at the time they were duty free. A proposition was made to strike them out from the reported bill, so as to leave them duty free, Mr. Polk voted against the proposition, and in favor of taxing tea and coffee!

This was at a time when they were reducing the tariff, and a more vital blow at "incidental protection," could not have been given.

The organ of Mr. Polk—the Nashville Union, says,

"We wish it borne in mind, that the oppressive Tariff of 1812, has been condemned by every true democrat, and by none more decidedly than Mr. Van Buren. That its provisions are viewed with abhorrence by Governor Polk and all his friends we need not repeat."

Mr. Polk in his letter to John K. Kane, Esq., admits these facts ; he confines the enumeration of the Tariff laws to those upon which he voted, not being in 1842 a member of Congress, he omits the only important law, that of 1842: he says he supported Mr. Verplank's bill. This is the bill which the Legislature of Pennsylvania unanimously denounced, and which Mr. Muhlenberg then in Congress, opposed.

Hear his friends in South Carolina. At a public dinner given to Mr. Pickens, the Congressional leader of Mr. Polk's friends in Congress, the following toasts were drank :

"By Col. F. A. Calhoun—The combination between Abolitionists, Manufacturers, Politicians, and Foreign Dictators: An unholy alliance of fanaticism, rapacity, corrupt ambition, and venal arrogance. The people of the nation will break it asunder and chastise its presumption."

"James K. Polk and Geo. M. Dallas—Identified as they are with the great public questions at issue, South Carolina will give them her cordial and united support."

Mr. Henly, of Indiana, in Congress, esteemed the most able speaker on the loco foco side, in that State, speaking of Mr. M'Kay's bill of last session, says,

"We very well knew that it was of no use to pass it in the House now, as we have not the majority in the Senate. Give us a majority there, and then see if we do not pass the bill! We will do it! For such is our purpose—such is our resolute determination."

Mr. Polk, in accepting the Baltimore Nomination, adopts the resolution of the Baltimore Convention. The 4th resolution is the text of nullification, or anti-tariff doctrine.

"Resolved, That justice and sound policy forbid the federal government to foster one branch of industry to the detriment of another, or to cherish the interests of one portion to the injury of another portion of our common country; that every citizen and every section of the country has a right to demand and insist upon an equality of rights and privileges, and to complete and ample protection of persons and property from domestic violence or foreign aggression."

But Mr. Polk supported Mr. Clay's compromise bill, and therefore, it is alleged, there is no difference between them. They represented adverse interests; Mr. Clay the American System—Mr. Polk Free trade. The state of the country in reference to South Carolina, demanded an adjustment, and a compromise was effected. Does that place them on the same footing? Mr. Clay and General Jackson might as well be identified, because the one introduced and the other finally sanctioned the compromise bill.

But let us have the opinions of the parties on this subject.

In a circular addressed by Mr. Polk, to the citizens of Tennessee, dated 3rd of April, 1839, speaking of the Compromise Act, he says,

"In repeated instances he (Gen. Jackson) recommended modifications and reductions of the tariff, with a view to the final abandonment of the odious and unjust system. So effectual were these recommendations, and so rapid the change of public opinion, that the friends of the tariff, and even Mr. Clay, its imputed father, seized on a favorable moment TO SAVE THE WHOLE FROM DESTRUCTION BY A TIMELY COMPROMISE. It was the defence of Mr. Clay with his friends at the north, that by yielding a part, HE PREVENTED THE DESTRUCTION OF THE WHOLE, and in their continued and devoted support of him, the northern capitalists have shown that they are grateful for the fortunate rescue."

In reference to this Act, on the 3rd of January, 1840, immediately after Gen. Harrison's nomination at Harrisburg, in the Senate of the United States, Mr. Clay says,

"I saw that this great interest had so got in the power of the Chief Magistrate, that it was evident that, at the next session of Congress, THE WHOLE PROTECTIVE

SYSTEM WOULD BE SWEEPED BY THE BOARD. I therefore desired to give it at least, a lease of years; and for that purpose, I, in concert with others, brought forward that measure, which was NECESSARY TO SAVE THAT INTEREST FROM TOTAL ANNIHILATION."

At Wilmington, Del., on the 15th of June, 1844, John M. Clayton said,

"His judgment on the subject confirmed my own opinions; and I owed while he lived a debt of gratitude for his assistance on that occasion, which, although I never had it in power to repay, yet have I never failed, either before or since his lamented death, to acknowledge. Thus assured, my feeble aid was freely given to that great measure; which, while it SAVED THE MANUFACTURING INTEREST FROM SUDDEN AND UTTER DESTRUCTION, soothed and conciliated the angry passions of men, then ready to rush upon revolution and bloodshed; and gave ample time to the friends of the protective policy to rally in its support, before the dearest interests of the country could be fatally affected. Any attempt to withstand and repel the flood then rushing upon us, would have been fruitless. IT WAS CLEAR THAT WE SHOULD BE SWEEPED AWAY BY THE TORRENT. We preferred to divide, to divert, and to retard it. And I then thought and still think, that the mighty effort of Mr. Clay, on that occasion, TO SAVE HIS FAVORITE MEASURE FROM THE DANGER WHICH THREATENED IT FROM EVERY QUARTER, as the most triumphant act of his life."

This coincidence of attestation to the merit of Mr. Clay, on the Compromise Act, is conclusive.

The most conclusive proof of the hostility of Mr. Polk and his friends to the Tariff policy, is their support of the foreign valuation, or ad valorem duties, in preference to the *Home* valuation, or specific duties. The former makes the invoice of the foreign shipper the means of assessing the duties, the latter makes the value here the criterion, or levies here the specific duty. The former gives the foreign importer every opportunity to cheat and defraud, and our Federal Courts in Boston, New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore, have for the last 4 years been constantly employed in detecting their frauds. The revenue has been cheated out of millions—the amount cannot be ascertained—it is still carried on to a great extent,—but it decreases the duty, and operates adversely on the Tariff, and therefore Mr. Polk and his friends have supported the ad valorem with the foreign cost, as the proper mode of levying the duty.

Mr. Clay, in the Senate of the United States, on the 22d of February, 1833, proposed the "Home valuation," which was carried, Yeas 26, Nays 16. (1)

On the 1st of March, 1842, he again enforced a "Home valuation" with all his strength. (2)

On the other hand, Mr. Polk and his friends have always opposed this wise and salutary measure, not because they would connive at the frauds and perjury which it would prevent, but because it favours Incidental Protection. (3)

One of the prominent features in Mr. McKay's bill is the substitution of the old ad valorem duty in the place of specific duties on a number of the most important articles. (4)

Another proof of hostility to the Tariff, furnished by Mr. Polk,

(1) 44 Niles' Reg., p. 5.

(2) Clay's Life, 2 vol. p. 549-559.

(3) Congressional Deb., vol. 6, p. 979-87.

(4) McKay's Rep., No. 366, p. 11.

is his opposition to the pensions paid to Revolutionary Soldiers. It would be unjust to Mr. Polk to refer this to any other cause than a determination to prevent the imposition of revenue, which might be used for incidental protection.

His refusal to assist the poor of Alexandria, at a time of great distress, with a few cords of wood, is based upon the same principle.

The benefits of the Tariff are universally felt, it works well, it gives South Carolina a market for her cotton and the Agricultural States, a market for their flour. In a recent Congressional Document, No. 177, p. 41 : It is stated, that in 1842, the State of Massachusetts consumed more flour, than was exported from the United States to all foreign countries. Mr. Webster, in his speech delivered at Albany, on the 26th of August, 1844, enumerated a few STAPLE ARTICLES, of raw material, amounting annually to FORTY MILLIONS OF DOLLARS, raised in other States and used in the State of Massachusetts; and, among other articles, SEVEN MILLIONS OF COTTON from the Southern States.

In 1842, Mr. Tyler sent two distinguished financiers, Messrs. Macalester and Robinson, to Europe, to borrow money on the faith of the United States, and they could not obtain one dollar; now our U. S. five per cent. Stocks are from ten to fifteen per cent. above par, and we have an over-flowing Treasury.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE PROCEEDS OF THE PUBLIC LANDS.

Next to the Tariff, this is the most important subject, now at issue. The public lands were purchased by the States who achieved the Independence.

The State of Virginia, on the 7th of March, 1784, ceded them as

"A common fund, for the use and benefit of such of the United States as have become, or shall become members of the confederation, or federal alliance of the said States, Virginia inclusive, according to their annual respective proportions in the general charge and expenditure, and shall be faithfully and bona fide disposed of for that purpose, and for no other use or purpose whatever."

Massachusetts, Connecticut, South and North Carolina and Georgia, ceded their public lands on the same terms. (5)

In 1833, Mr. Clay's bill to distribute the proceeds passed with little or no opposition, the opposition being rather to the details than the principles of the bill. It passed in the House of Representatives, Yeas 96, Nays 46; and finally in the Senate, Yeas 23, Nays 5. (6) It received the unanimous support (with but one dissentient,) of the whole Pennsylvania Delegation, among others, the vote of Mr. Dallas and the late Mr. Muhlenburg. Although the State of Pennsylvania was then under no pressure, this measure received the sanction, and was the settled policy of the Democracy of Pennsylvania. Since, however, war

(5) 45 Niles' Reg., p. 276.

(6) 44 Niles' Reg., p. 25, 49, 50.

has been made upon the 'Tariff, an entire change has been produced. If the proceeds of the public lands are paid into the 'Treasury of the U. States, the wants of the Government are supplied, and the means of protection by revenue are diminished or destroyed in proportion to the amount of receipts from this source. Accordingly, the Baltimore Loco Foco Convention,

"Resolved, That the proceeds of the public lands ought to be sacredly applied to the National objects specified in the Constitution; and that we are opposed to the law lately adopted, and to any law for the distribution of such proceeds among the States, as alike inexpedient in policy, and repugnant to the Constitution."

Mr. Polk approved of, and the self-styled Democracy of Pennsylvania responded to this doctrine, now proclaimed, because *It is the death blow to "INCIDENTAL PROTECTION" of domestic industry.*

These lands are the property of the different States in their sovereign capacity, ceded to them before the adoption of the Federal Constitution. We are overwhelmed with debt, our public faith has been forfeited, we are degraded before the world as defaulters, our taxes are enormous and oppressive, relief is at hand, and we are denied it, because it would protect the Tariff and domestic industry. Let every Pennsylvanian pause and reflect, before they give their vote to Mr. Polk.

On this question Mr. Polk has, volunteered to array himself against the Democracy of Pennsylvania. (*See Appendix D.*)

A NATIONAL BANK.

Mr. Clay, in his speech at Raleigh, defines his position. He is friendly to a National Bank, but does "not desire any Bank of the U. States attempted or established until it is imperatively demanded by the opinion of the people." Is this any offence?

The Democracy of the Union supported a National Bank during the war of 1812, and established it after the peace, in 1816.

Gen. Jackson, as Governor of Florida, in a letter to Langdon Cheves, then President of the United States Bank, dated at Pensacola, August 15, 1821, recommended to the Bank to extend its branches to the Territories, as convenient "to the inhabitants," and "beneficial to the institution. In 1832, in returning his Veto, he declares himself a friend to such an Institution, and says, if applied to he would have given the plan. (7)

In a memorial to the Bank of the United States, dated at Albany, the 17th July, 1826, Mr. Van Buren recommends a Branch at that City, and says, its notes would constitute "the circulating medium," between the Eastern and Western States. (8)

In 1831 and 1832 the Democracy of Pennsylvania instructed their Senators and Representatives to support the renewal of the charter. These resolutions were introduced by the Hon. Charles J. Ingersoll, the present loco foco member of Congress from the 3rd District in Pennsylvania. (9)

Can that be an offence in 1844 which was so patriotic in 1814-15-16, and 1831-32?

(7) Cong. Doc., 23d Congress, 2d Session, No. 17, p. 249, 250.

(8) Id. id. p. 251, 252.

(9) Jour. House of Rep. Pa., 1830-31, p. 415.

But Mr. Clay has changed. In 1811 he believed a Bank unconstitutional, and has since supported it. In this there is no change of principle. In 1811 Mr. Clay believed the Government could conduct its fiscal operations without a Bank. In his opinion it was not necessary, and therefore unconstitutional. The war of 1812 developed the practical operation of our Government, and showed that such an Institution was necessary in any public crisis. There is no more discrepancy in this change, than in voting *against* a standing army in time of *peace*, and voting *for* it in time of *war*.

In this change he is sustained by Monroe, Crawford, Eppes, (the son-in-law of Mr. Jefferson,) Gallatin, Lowndes, Forsyth, Simon Snyder, Ingham, Lacock, Roberts, a host of patriots, and by the Democracy of Pennsylvania and the Union. He was sustained by the late A. J. Dallas, one of the soundest constitutional lawyers of the country, a statesman of the highest order, in purity of purpose and energy of action never excelled, for thirty years the intellectual Hercules of Democracy in Pennsylvania, and a man who rendered services to his country, during the last war, scarcely inferior to any individual in the Nation. (See Appendix B & C.)

Mr. Clay was also upheld by the authority of the author and expounder of the Federal Constitution, the virtuous and upright Madison.

All these distinguished patriots changed, like Mr. Clay, on the subject of a National Bank.

A National Bank has been 40 years in existence, and it is alleged, that, under the administration of Mr. Biddle, abuses have been committed. Granted; though it was when the Bank was a State Institution. Does the abuse of one man or administration, among so many Presidents and different administrations, prove any thing against the use of the power?

It is, however, an open question, to be decided by the Representatives of the people. On this subject it is conceded, that a difference of opinion exists among the Whigs, and many of them are opposed to the Establishment of a National Bank, at this time, as inexpedient, among whom may be classed the author of these remarks.

TEXAS.

To present a new issue in the hope that any change might be for the better, this question has been presented. I pass over the extension of slavery, the folly of increasing our territory when we do not know what to do with that which we already possess, the assumption of the debt of Texas, the fact that there is not an acre of good land left, and state but a single feature. Col. Benton has shewn, with the Map in his hand, that the Texas treaty proposes to seize and take by force, Mexican territory 2000 miles in length, and some 100 miles in breadth, including villages, towns, and capital cities, now under the protection of Mexico, as indisputably as Philadelphia, Lancaster and Pittsburg are under the government of Pennsylvania. The excuse is more humiliating than the act—that Mexico is feeble, and cannot resist. SIXTY-EIGHT years have rolled

by since the 4th July, 1776, and the United States have never taken one dollar from any foreign citizen or subject, or one acre of ground from any foreign nation, without their consent and a full equivalent. It is a proud illustration of the superiority of a Republic, over every other form of government, to which the patriot, the philosopher and the philanthropist, may point with delight and admiration. Shall we now turn and become a nation of robbers and freebooters upon the oldest sister Republic of the continent, a nation on terms of peace and amity, and now in the progress of paying us for the unauthorized aggressions of her cruisers? It was a sublime spectacle to see the two distinguished chiefs of their respective parties, distant from each other, without concert, simultaneously enter their solemn protest against this most unholy and wicked attempt; but it was a humiliating exhibition to see one of these chiefs abandoned by his party, because by the honest declaration of his sentiments, he was *supposed* to have been rendered unavailable. The result has proved the fallacy of this *supposition*, and at this moment, Mr. Polk has no mill-stone around his neck, like the annexation of Texas. For whom is this sacrifice to be made? For a people who, we are told, are willing to become a market for the sale and purchase of slaves from the South, or go into colonial vassallage, with the abolition of slavery, as a dependency of Great Britain, just as the United States shall determine to receive or reject them as an integral part of our Union.

MERITS OF MR. POLK AND MR. CLAY.

MR. POLK.

Mr. Polk it is said, has been in public life for 25 years. What public benefit has he ever rendered the people? He supported the Sub-Treasury, and the Executive Veto. He was, his biographers say, born on the 2nd November, 1795, and was therefore, at the time of the Battle of New Orleans, in his 20th year, and beyond the age of 18 years, when, by the law of Tennessee, in time of actual war he was liable to Militia duty. Where was he at that time? Like thousands of Pennsylvanians of his age, in the tented field? No. Senator Foster tells us he left him in the office of Felix Grundy, studying law, when he (Mr. Foster,) marched under the command of Gen. Jackson. His friends, aware of his nakedness of all pretension, have put him forth as "the Young Hickory," a more bitter and significant sarcasm upon Mr. Polk, than any that could have been pronounced by his opponents.

MR. CLAY.

Honor, patriotism, and a successful career of public life, present Mr. Clay. His life is the title page of the glory of his Country. From the time that he first entered the Hall of Congress, he has been the friend of the cause of liberty, throughout the world.

In the month of December, 1811, he took his seat, and was elected speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States. We were then esteemed by the world a degraded people. Not a native citizen could leave his country, without the danger of impressment, nor a ship traverse the ocean, without seizure and confiscation by

Great Britain. In December, 1811, Henry Clay, coming from the western frontier state, proclaimed that he would never rest until we had maintained our rights, by an open declaration of war. It was declared, and Pennsylvania applauded the deed. The only two members of the delegation who voted against it, she promptly dismissed. She lent more money to the government, sent more recruits to the army, and poured forth more volunteers than any state in the Union; while she proudly boasted, that her soil was never tarnished by the foot of an enemy, but as a prisoner of War. It was at this time, the hour of danger, that the patriots and statesmen of Pennsylvania stood by Henry Clay, in the counsels of the nation; and that Markle marched to the frontier to protect our citizens from the scalping knife and the tomahawk. In the darkest hour of gloom and despair, Mr. Clay was seen rising above universal despondency, and exhorting his countrymen to march to victory or death. (*See Appendix A.*)

Mr. Madison would have appointed him, though a civilian, commander in chief of the Army, but he could not be spared from the councils of the nation—he was then sent abroad where he became the bold and intrepid negotiator of the rights of his country. On his return, he was again elected, by the Democracy of the Country, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and continued in that station, until he was transferred to the Senate. Twice in that body he has been designated, not by his own party alone, but the consent of the whole Nation, the pacificator of the discordant factions, which threatened the dissolution of the Union; and it now owes its existence to the wisdom, energy and patriotism of Henry Clay, during the agitation of the Missouri question and South Carolina Nullification.

He has for thirty years, been the untiring friend of the interests of Pennsylvania, although he has habitually received from a majority of her people, nothing but the most unmerited rebuke and reproach.

He has always been generous to a political adversary or a rival, and, at this day, he cannot be provoked into an attack upon the patriotism of Gen. Jackson.

Mr Jefferson in a letter dated, the 25th May, 1823, says,

“As for Mr. Clay, I consider him to be one of the most talented and brilliant men and statesmen, that the country ever produced, and should I live many years longer, I HOPE TO SEE HIM HOLD THE PLACE OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE OF THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC.”

At a later period, in the contest of 1832, Mr. Clay had the confidence and good wishes of Madison and Monroe, in preference even to the claims of the Hero of New Orleans. It is admitted that Mr. Clay up to the year 1825, when, like Mr. Van Buren, he opposed Gen. Jackson, was second only to Jackson, in the affection of the Democracy of Pennsylvania. His motives for this act have been most grossly abused. The venerable sage of Quincy, has placed the stamp of falsehood upon the exploded slander of Bargain and Sale, and if there had been any understanding, Mr. Adams must have been a party to, and cognizant of it.

I ask what act of Mr. Clay since 1825, can be pointed at that is inconsistent with a patriot and a statesman, and his former life and character? None.

I shall not vindicate the character of Mr. Clay, against the charges of being a duellist and a card-player. These slanders were circulated during the last war by the hireling press at home, who opposed the Administration, and its mercenary allies abroad. The British press of that day exhausted all the epithets of Duellist, Murderer, Gambler, now used by Amos Kendall and his coadjutors, and then gravely added, he

"Was the man that killed Tecumseh, and that he cut several razor straps out of his back after he was dead!" (10.)

Such calumnies were then treated, by the Democracy of Pennsylvania, with the scorn and contempt which they merited.

The parting scene in the Senate of the United States on the 31st of March, 1842, should silence these slanderers. When Mr. Clay announced his retirement, that body, on motion of Mr. Preston, unanimously adjourned without entering on any business, as a tribute of respect to this great and distinguished man, an honour it is believed, never at any time, paid to any other individual in this Republic. (*See Appendix E.*)

GENERAL MARKLE.

A parting word as to this honest man and brave soldier. His country was in danger, and he risked his life and pledged his patrimony to sustain her cause. He has, since, lived a quiet and unobtrusive life, and after 30 years, has been, without his interference, called into requisition by his fellow-citizens. In 1816 the Nation preferred Mr. Monroe as President to W. H. Crawford, one of the noblest of creation, because Mr. Monroe had pledged his private fortune to purchase the arms and ammunition to defend New Orleans. The conduct of Gen. Markle was equally meritorious, although his modest deportment has kept him out of the public eye. In private life he is without stain or reproach. But he is a German, and has not received the advantages of a classical education. The same objections were made, in the same spirit, to Simon Snyder, and yet he made one of the most useful and patriotic Governors of whom Pennsylvania ever boasted.

Will Pennsylvania reward those who have been her friends and benefactors? is the question at issue, and let the sound intellect and the honest feeling of the State decide the question.

A P P E N D I X.

(A)

Extract from the speech of Henry Clay, in the House of Representatives, 31st December, 1811.

"He hoped to God that ere long he should see every man proudly shoulder a musket to defend his liberties.

The honorable gentleman proceeded to present his views on this bill, as it involved the important question of war. And here he must beg leave to differ with those gentlemen who had thought it improper to debate upon war in the face of day. It was impossible to conceal the measures of preparation for war.

Sir, we are told this government is not calculated to stand the shock of war; that gentlemen will lose their seats in this and the other house; that your benches will be

filled by other men, who after you have carried on the war, will make for you an ignominious peace. He could not believe that to retain their seats was the extent of the *amor patriæ*, of gentlemen in this House. Could they let their brave countrymen, a Daviess and his associates in arms, perish in manfully fighting their battles, while they would meanly cling to their places? But he could not persuade himself that the nation would be ungrateful. He was convinced that when they knew that their government had been strictly impartial towards the belligerents—for surely no gentlemen in that house could be so base as to ascribe partiality or other improper motives to them — when they perceived the sincere and persevering exertions of their government to preserve peace; they would continue to adhere to them, even in an unsuccessful war to defend their rights; to assert their honor, the dignity and independence of the country. But his ideas of duty were such, that when his rights were invaded, he must advance to their defence, let what might be the consequence; even if death itself were to be his certain fate.” (1)

Extracts from the speech of Henry Clay, in the House of Representatives, 8th January, 1813.

“If Virginia really cherished a reprehensible ambition, and aimed to monopolize the chief magistracy of the country, how was such a purpose to be accomplished? Virginia, alone, cannot elect a president, whose elevation depends upon a plurality of electoral votes, and a consequent concurrence of many states. Would Vermont, disinterested Pennsylvania, the Carolinas, independent Georgia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Ohio, Louisiana, all consent to become the tools of an inordinate ambition.

The administration has erred in the steps which it has taken to restore peace, but its error has been not in doing too little, but in betraying too great a solicitude for that event. An honorable peace is attainable only by an efficient war. My plan would be to call out the ample resources of the country, give them a judicious direction, prosecute the war with the utmost vigor, strike wherever we can reach the enemy, at sea or on land, and negotiate the terms of a peace at Quebec or Halifax. We are told that England is a proud and lofty nation that disdaining to wait for danger, meets it half way. Haughty as she is, we once triumphed over her, and if we do not listen to the councils of timidity and despair we shall again prevail. In such a cause, with the aid of Providence, we must come out crowned with success; but if we fail, let us fail like men, lash ourselves to our gallant tars, and expire together in one common struggle, fighting for SEAMEN'S RIGHTS AND FREE TRADE” OF THE OCEAN. (2)

(B.)

Extract from the Treasury Report, dated Washington, Oct. 17, 1814.

“But, after all, I should not merit the confidence, which it will be my ambition to acquire, if I were to suppress the declaration of an opinion, that, in these times, THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL BANK will not only be USEFUL in promoting the general welfare, but that it is NECESSARY and PROPER for carrying into execution some of the most important powers constitutionally vested in the government.”

A. J. DALLAS. (3)

J. W. EPPES, Esq.,
Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means.

(C)

After the peace, in perhaps the most elaborate Report of our finances ever given, Mr. Dallas says,

“THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL BANK is regarded as the BEST and PERHAPS THE ONLY ADEQUATE RESOURCE to relieve the country and the government from the present embarrassments. Authorized to issue notes which will be received in all payments to the United States, the circulation of its issues will be co-extensive with the union; and there will exist a constant demand, bearing a just proportion to the annual amount of the duties and taxes to be collected, independent of the general circulation for com-

(1) 1 Niles' Reg. p. 333-4.

(2) 3 Niles' Reg. p. 372-6.

(3) 7 Niles' Reg., p. 107.

mercial and social purposes. A national bank will therefore possess the means and the opportunity of supplying a circulating medium of equal use and value in every state, and in every district of every state. Established by the authority of the government of the United States; accredited by the government to the whole amount of its notes in circulation; and entrusted as the depository of the government with all the accumulations of the public treasure; the national bank independent of its immediate capital, will enjoy every recommendation which can merit and secure the confidence of the public. Organized upon principles of responsibility, but of independence, the national bank will be retained within its legitimate sphere of action without just apprehension from the misconduct of its directors or from the encroachments of the government. Eminent in its resources, and in its example, the national bank will conciliate, aid, and lead, the state banks in all that is necessary for the restoration of credit, public and private. And, acting upon a compound capital, partly of stock and partly of gold and silver, the national bank will be the ready instrument to enhance the value of the public securities and to restore the currency of the national coin."

A. J. DALLAS,

Secretary of the Treasury. (4)

Treasury Department, 6th December, 1815.

(D)

Extract from Ex-Governor Polk's Answers to Interrogatories propounded to him and Governor Jones, dated 15th May, 1843.

"The Legislature of Pennsylvania, in the month of January last, avowed in direct terms, that an increase of the Tariff was their object. They passed a Resolve instructing their Senators and Representatives to advocate and vote for the distribution, and passed a second Resolve in the following words, viz:

"Resolved, That our Senators be further instructed, and our Representatives requested to vote for such modification or adjustment of the Tariff, as may increase the revenue derived from imports equal to the wants of the National Government, so that at no time hereafter, under any pretext whatever, shall any money arising from the sales of the Public lands be used by the General Government."

"I voted for the act of 1832—because it reduced the Tariff of 1828 to lower rates. That made some reduction, though not as much as I desired to have made. I voted for the act of March 2d, 1833, (commonly called the compromise act,) which reduced the rates of the act of 1832 to still lower rates, and finally brought the rates of the act of 1832 down to a point at which no article was, after the 30th of June, 1842, to be subject to a duty higher than 20 per cent. This was the law when the Whig Congress came into power. By THE TARIFF ACT OF THE 30th AUGUST, 1842, THE COMPROMISE ACT WAS VIOLATED AND REPEALED. I am opposed to the act of 1842, not regarding it to be a revenue Tariff, but in many of its provisions highly protective and oppressive in its character. I am in favour of the restoration of the compromise act of 1833."

"In order to show that the Tariff passed by the late Congress is not a revenue measure, in a late speech delivered at Jackson, and published, I used the following language:

"No higher than 20 per cent. was imposed on any article, after the 30th of June, '42, until the 30th of August, '42, on which latter day the present Tariff law was passed by the Whig Congress. THE WHIG CONGRESS LAID VIOLENT HANDS ON THE COMPROMISE OF '33, AND BROKE IT UP."

"It was clear, therefore, that the late Tariff act was not a revenue measure. It had raised the rates of duties so high as to shut out imports, and consequently to cut off and diminish revenue." (5)

(E)

Mr. Preston rose and said: "what had just taken place was an epoch in their legislative history, and from the feeling which was evinced, he plainly saw that there was little disposition to attend to business. He would therefore move that the Senate adjourn; which motion was unanimously agreed to!" (6)

(4) 9 Niles' Reg., p. 276.

(5) Pamphlet, p. 5, 6, 21, 24, 25.

(6) Life of H. Clay, 2d vol. 568.

Manufactured by
GAYLORD BROS. Inc.
Syracuse, N. Y.
Stockton, Calif.

M323556

